DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 414 998 PS 025 508

AUTHOR	Collins, Ann; Aber, J. Lawrence
TITLE	How Welfare Reform Can Help or Hurt Children. Children and Welfare Reform Issue Brief 1.
INSTITUTION	National Center for Children in Poverty, New York, NY.
SPONS AGENCY	Ford Foundation, New York, NY.; Carnegie Corp. of New York, NY.
PUB DATE	1997-00-00
NOTE	13p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia School of Public Health, 154 Haven Avenue, New York, NY 10032; phone: 212-544-4200 ($5, includes shipping and handling).
PUB TYPE	Reports - General (140)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Child Development; Child Health; *Child Welfare; Day Care; *Family Income; Family Needs; Family Programs; Federal Aid; Federal Programs; Financial Support; Parenting Skills; *Welfare Recipients; *Welfare Services
IDENTIFIERS	Aid to Families with Dependent Children; Family Support; Personal Responsibility and Work Opp Recon Act; Temporary Assistance for Needy Families; *Welfare Reform

ABSTRACT

The issue brief describes the research base for the National Center for Children in Poverty's (NCCP's) framework to assess welfare changes from a children's perspective and points to lessons from current and past welfare-to-work evaluations. Many changes are now implemented in welfare policies due to new legislation titled the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act. Among the changes in welfare policy, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) has been replaced by the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), which does not hold a guarantee of income assistance for single mothers with children and which has a 5-year lifetime limit for the recipient. Most changes in policy are driven by adult-focused goals, but it is estimated that most likely TANF policy will continue to be children-focused as it was for AFDC. Welfare reform can help or hurt children by changing (1) the family income, (2) level of parental stress and/or parenting styles, and (3) children's access to basic services. There is little information available to policymakers about the ways to protect children and enhance their growth and development within the welfare reform context. Looking at the implications of past welfare program evaluations it is evident that: (1) family income improved only in states that allowed families to combine cash benefits with earnings; (2) there is little or no information about how welfare reform affected parental stress and parenting styles; and (3) the availability of support for health insurance and child care services affected parents' participation in welfare-to-work efforts. The 5-year limit for receipt of TANF funds means that state and community policymakers and program operators may have very targeted and limited opportunities to assist families receiving cash assistance. A framework that assesses the impact of welfare reform on family income, parental stress, and access to children's services can help clarify the potential trade-offs and policy options involved in formulating and implementing welfare reforms. (AS)

ED 414 998

Children and Welfare Reform

Issue Brief 1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

How Welfare Reform Can Help or Hurt Children

Ann Collins
J. Lawrence Aber

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Elizabeth Sizeke
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

NATIONAL CENTER FOR CHILDREN IN POVERTY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Series Introduction

Recent federal welfare legislation, P.L. 104-193, The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, can have a major impact on the health and development of young children living in poverty. Changes now being implemented in welfare policies and programs take many forms, but most of them have one thing in common—they are almost all driven by adult-focused goals. However, two-thirds of recipients of the former welfare program known as Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) were not adults—they were children, a reality likely to continue. While policymakers and program directors often recognize this fact, there is very little information available to them about how to protect children and enhance their growth and development within the context of welfare changes.

Recognizing this, NCCP is developing a series of issue briefs designed to explore the implications of different aspects of welfare reform for the well-being of children. This first issue brief describes the research base for NCCP's framework to assess welfare changes from a children's perspective and points to lessons from current and past welfare-to-work evaluations. Other issue briefs will be available in the near future. The issue briefs are part of a larger Leadership Network on Children and Welfare Reform supported by grants from the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the Foundation for Child Development. NCCP takes responsibility for the facts and opinions presented in this issue brief.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR CHILDREN IN POVERTY (NCCP) was established in 1989 at the School of Public Health, Columbia University, with core support from the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The Center's mission is to identify and promote strategies that reduce the number of young children living in poverty in the United States, and that improve the life chances of the millions of children under age six who are growing up poor.

The Center:

- Alerts the public to demographic statistics about child poverty and to the scientific research on the serious impact of poverty on young children, their families, and their communities.
- Designs and conducts field-based studies to identify programs, policies, and practices that work best for young children and their families living in poverty.
- Disseminates information about early childhood care and education, child health, and family and community support to government officials, private organizations, and child advocates, and provides a state and local perspective on relevant national issues.
- Brings together public and private groups to assess the efficacy of current and potential strategies to lower the young child poverty rate and to improve the well-being of young children in poverty, their families, and their communities.
- Challenges policymakers and opinion leaders to help ameliorate the adverse consequences of poverty on young children.

© 1997 by the National Center for Children in Poverty

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

New federal welfare legislation can have a major impact on the well-being of young children living in poverty. This legislation, P.L. 104-193, The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act, marks the most significant change in welfare policy in decades. The new law:

- Replaces the 65-year-old guarantee of income assistance for single mothers with children (Aid to Families with Dependent Children, or AFDC) with a block grant called Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), which holds no such guarantee;
- Sets a five-year lifetime limit for the receipt of TANF funds for cash assistance or services for adult-headed families (children in families headed by adults receiving assistance can qualify again for assistance when they become adults and/or are in other circumstances);
- Establishes stringent requirements for parents to work in order to receive TANF funds, whether they come in the form of cash assistance or are used to pay for services; and
- Gives states very wide flexibility in how they can choose to spend the funds.[1]

This legislation builds on the momentum of the past few years, when state after state received federal waivers from what was then current law to experiment with cash-assistance programs. Long before the new federal law was passed, many states had established time limits of their own. Many of these are shorter than the five-year limit set by the legislation. Other state waiver provisions include lengthening the time families would automatically be eligible for child care subsidies; changing rules so that families could keep more of their earnings and still receive cash assistance; and using changes in grant levels to modify the behavior of adults in a range of areas from school attendance to having additional children while receiving cash assistance.

Changes now being implemented in welfare policies and programs take many forms, but most of them have one thing in common—they are almost all driven by adult-focused goals. However, two-thirds of recipients of the former welfare program called AFDC were not adults—they were children,a reality likely to continue.

Changes now being implemented in welfare policies and programs take many forms, but most of them have one thing in common—they are almost all driven by adult-focused goals. However, two-thirds of recipients of the program formerly called AFDC were not adults—they were children, a reality likely to continue. While policymakers and others often recognize this fact, there is very little information available to them about how to protect children and enhance their growth and development within the context of welfare reform.

While policymakers and others often recognize this fact, there is very little information available to them about how to protect children and enhance their growth and development within the context of welfare reform.

This is the first of a series of issue briefs on children and welfare reform developed by the National Center for Children in Poverty (NCCP). The issue briefs summarize information currently available about welfare and children. The focus is on strategies to establish and maintain protections for vulnerable children and to increase the potential for low-income families to enhance their children's health and well-being. The target audience for the issue briefs includes policymakers, program directors, advocates, researchers, and other leaders on the state and community level—all those who have a role, or a potential role, in crafting and implementing changes to the welfare system.

This issue brief draws from recent research and welfare experiment evaluations to develop a framework for understanding how federal and state welfare reform efforts could affect children. Two assumptions are especially relevant. The first one is that children are not themselves wealthy or poor; rather, they live in families that vary in their access to economic and social resources. In this country, the financial status of parents largely determines the material wealth or deprivation that both they and their children will confront.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Welfare reform has the potential to help or hurt children in three major ways: by changing family income; by changing the level of parental stress and/or parenting styles; and by changing children's access to and need for basic services

Therefore, one cannot significantly improve the lot of children without assisting their parents (indirectly when vouchers for children's services substitute for family income), nor can one punish parents without imposing hardships on children, at least in the short term. This is the crux of the struggle faced by policymakers who try to provide a safety net for children while simultaneously encouraging or discouraging specific behaviors on the part of adults.

Second, a growing body of research on children and families in poverty, and information from recent program and policy strategies, point to an emerging consensus that successful policies must take into account the needs of children when addressing the needs of parents, and the needs of parents when addressing the needs of children. In addition to basic economic security and access to high-quality supports and services, including education, health care, child care, and many others, it is also clear that families need to have the time and capacity to forge stable, positive parent-child relationships.

With this perspective, NCCP developed a framework to assess how state and community welfare-change strategies can affect children's well-being. Welfare reform has the potential to help or hurt children in three major ways:

- By changing family income;
- By changing the level of parental stress and/or parenting styles; and
- By changing children's access to and need for basic services, including child care, health care, and child welfare, as well as access to more comprehensive services that combine family support with child-focused services.

Although these three areas are very interrelated, we focus on them separately.

Family Income

Many studies have indicated that poverty significantly impedes the healthy growth and development of children. The material inadequacies brought on by poverty (such as insufficient nutrition, unsafe housing, dangerous neighborhoods, etc.) can be devastating for children's health and cognitive development.[2] Poverty often impedes children's access to safe and nurturing learning environments and limits opportunities for warm and responsive interactions with adults.[3]

Additionally, poor children are more likely than nonpoor children to be exposed to the risk factors associated with health problems.[4] The lack of nutritious food, decent shelter, and access to health care are seen in the higher rates of serious health problems among children who are poor, including:

- Prematurity and low birth weight, which entail significant health and developmental risk;[5]
- Hospitalization due to infectious diseases, chronic health problems, and accidents and injuries;[6] and
- Long-term health problems that influence a child throughout life, hampering learning and contributing to social and emotional difficulties.[7]

Researchers have found that in addition to a child's poverty status, the length of time spent in poverty, and the intensity of the poverty are powerful predictors of children's health and cognitive development.[8]

Research indicates that it is likely that poverty itself affects children's well-being, regardless of whether a family's primary source of income is cash assistance or wages. For example, children from poor families not on welfare had equivalent levels of health and behavior problems, and nearly as severe learning problems, as those from families receiving AFDC.[9] Therefore, efforts to decrease reliance on cash assistance as a primary source of income may be desirable for other reasons, but recent research indicates that changes in children's growth and development will be influenced by changes in the amount of family income, not the source.[10] In addition, the predictability of family income may also be important.[11]

Parental Stress

- Research shows that poverty affects children in part by influencing the behavior of their parents.[12] Like all parents, low-income parents not only work to meet their families' material needs, they also try to meet their children's emotional needs. However, low-income parents often face very high levels of chronic stress and depression, which can influence parenting styles. This relationship between chronic stressful conditions and depression and other mental health problems in parents is well documented.[13] For single parents, the psychological impacts of poverty and related hardships (unemployment, financial difficulties, isolation, and lack of supports) are especially severe. Single mothers are more likely than married mothers to experience anxiety, depression, and health problems.[14]

Parents' mental health status affects how they relate to their children.[15] Research shows that the increased stress brought on by poverty and related factors adds to other external events that increase the likelihood of abuse and neglect.[16] Research also indicates that poor single parents tend to be more punitive, inconsistent, and unresponsive when they interact with their children than are other parents.[17] The impacts of such parenting often show up as learning disabilities, psychological problems, and behavioral disturbances in children.[18]

Children's Services

Research underscores the importance of access for all children to high-quality services, such as health care, child care, and early education. Poverty limits many families' access to such services— a fact which has been amply documentated in virtually all service areas.[19]

It has long been accepted that all children need basic primary health care. However, for a significant number of children eligible for Medicaid, low reimbursement rates have restricted health care access.[20] For low-income families who are not receiving TANF, children may lack even this form of health insurance; low-income workers often have jobs that do not even include minimal health insurance benefits. In fact, over 61 percent of uninsured children live in working poor families.[21]

Research also consistently underlines the need for high-quality child care. Many studies have shown that care of poor quality can impede children's growth and development, while high-quality care promotes healthy growth and development.[22] These effects have been greatest for low-income and minority children.[23]

Children in poverty are also more likely to receive services from the child welfare system, including foster care, child protection, and child abuse prevention efforts.[24] Based on this research, the box below outlines several conclusions that can be drawn about the impact of welfare changes on children and their families.

Implications of a Children's Perspective on Welfare Reform

Family Income

Welfare reforms that leave families in poverty are unlikely to change children's prospects. Reforms that cause deeper and more persistent poverty will negatively affect children's growth and development. It seems likely that only welfare reform efforts that substantially increase the incomes of families on TANF will lead to better developmental outcomes for children.

Parenting and Parental Stress

Welfare reforms that increase parental stress or cause parents to be more harsh and punitive may have negative consequences for children. On the other hand, those policies that provide experiences and supports that strengthen parents' psychological resources could have positive consequences.

Children's Services

Welfare reforms that push children into low-quality child care or that limit their access to health care can have significant harmful effects on children. Conversely, welfare reform that enables families to obtain high-quality child care and continued or improved access to primary health care could have positive consequences for children. In addition, welfare reform that deprives families of needed social supports will only intensify the stressors that contribute to family disintegration.

Lessons from Past Welfare-to-Work Evaluations

Evaluations of past state welfare-to-work programs provide us with very little information about how previous welfare reform has actually affected children's growth and development. Most of the evaluations have measured economic impacts on families and cost savings to states. In part, the lack of specific information about children reflects the fact that welfare reforms largely aim to change adult behaviors, and therefore many evaluations have focused on how these adult behaviors have changed, with little regard to children.

Further, what we do know from past evaluations has limited usefulness today because the actual approaches today are often much different (e.g., there has never been time-limited cash assistance and now there will be on a massive scale) and because the context in which welfare reform is being implemented is changing in terms of other supports available to working families, such as food stamps and child care assistance.

However, even with their limitations, it is helpful to summarize what we do know about the effects of welfare reform on children from these evaluations:

- ***Five years after parents had entered welfare-to-work programs, earnings substantially increased, but in many cases, family income did not increase since cash-assistance benefits decreased. (The effect of changes in family income or earnings on child health and development was not considered in the evaluations.)***

  Studies of welfare-to-work programs that evaluated short-term program effects (usually measured after two years) typically showed only moderate differences in earnings between participant and control groups.[25] A Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC) study of the *five-year* impacts of four welfare-to-work programs showed much more substantial gains in earnings for adults who participated, with the greatest improvement being $2,076 annually. However, despite the earnings increases among participants in all four sites, reductions in their cash assistance meant that the overall income of participants improved in only two of the four programs. The MDRC report did not indicate the magnitude of income gains in the two programs where family income went up. The researchers also concluded that programs that go beyond job-search assistance to include education and training components are more likely to improve the long-term economic well-being of program participants.[26]

Families newly entering the workforce from cash assistance programs faced virtually all of the same issues faced by other low-income working families, including difficulty with child care and health care.

- ***Parents' perceptions of the adequacy of their children's child care was important for parents' continued success in education and training programs. (No information was collected on the effects of what parents perceived as adequate child care on the growth and development of children.)***

  In a study of participants in the Greater Avenues for Independence Program (GAIN), (California's education and training program for welfare recipients), women unhappy with their child care arrangements were over twice as likely as those who were satisfied to drop out of GAIN before the end of one year. In this study, "adequacy" was defined as convenience, quality, and congruence between parents' preferred work schedules and child care arrangements.[27] Although how child care adequacy affects children has been mostly ignored in states' evaluations, other research on child care indicates that children's cognitive and social development are closely related to the quality of care they receive.[28]

- ***Families newly entering the workforce from cash assistance programs faced virtually all of the same issues faced by other low-income working families, including difficulty obtaining and paying for child care and health care services.***

  Families leaving welfare for work are likely to face difficulties in securing child care due to odd work hours, irregular schedules, and temporary work.[29] Since most formal child care programs operate during standard business hours and have only full-time spaces

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

available, these programs are largely unavailable to working poor parents. Moreover, many of these programs are unaffordable for low-income working families.[30]

In addition, families leaving welfare for work often enter minimum-wage jobs without health insurance benefits.[31] In fact, children whose families received AFDC (and were therefore automatically eligible for Medicaid) were six times more likely than children in working poor families to have health insurance and twice as likely to receive routine medical care.[32] Studies of California's GAIN program found that participants received minimal or no health insurance (only 27 percent of jobs offered any insurance).[33] Neither this nor other studies measured specific impacts on indicators of children's health.

- ***Few of the possible effects of welfare-to-work programs on parenting styles and parental stress were captured by evaluations. Most did not include measures. Those that did found modest to insignificant effects.***

  Very little research has been done to identify the effects of welfare initiatives on parenting, and those that have paid attention to this issue have included only a few measures and have not found many strong effects.[34] For instance, an analysis of the evaluations of seven welfare or education initiatives (three of which were aimed at teenage parents) showed that programs that included a parenting component resulted in significant levels of participation, but the measurable results were moderate.[35]

- ***Very little is known about the impact of past welfare strategies on other child- and family-service systems—namely child welfare programs and other family support programs.***

  Research suggests that poverty strongly predicts child neglect. For example, a recent national study found that the incidence of abuse and neglect is approximately 22 percent higher among families with incomes below $15,000 than among families with incomes above $30,000.[36] Poverty also predicts, although not as strongly, other forms of child maltreatment.[37] However, there has been very little research or analysis of the impact of specific changes in welfare policies and programs on child protection and child welfare caseloads. One recent study, carried out in Los Angeles County, did find that child abuse and neglect referrals jumped 12 percent following AFDC grant reductions of 2.7 percent, and 20 percent after additional reductions totaling 5.8 percent.[38] It is also known that between 1985 and 1995 there was a 37 percent increase in children receiving AFDC and a 79 percent increase in the foster care population.[39]

Future Lessons from Current State Welfare-to-Work Evaluations

NCCP's careful examination of evaluation plans of current state welfare experiments indicates that there may be missed opportunities to gain a much deeper understanding of the effects of welfare initiatives on children. Under prior law, states that received waivers from federal rules pursuant to Section 1115 of the Social Security Act were required to implement random-assignment evaluations to assess the effects of their particular welfare reform approach. As a result, states began to evaluate a variety of new welfare strategies, such as time limits, strengthening work requirements, and more generous child care and health insurance benefits. This requirement is not included in the new federal law; however, it appears that many states have chosen to continue with their evaluations, at least in part.[40]

Although state welfare waiver evaluations offer potential opportunities to learn more about welfare initiatives' effects on children, NCCP's analyses of the evaluation plans from 30 states indicate that children are not a primary focus of many of the evaluations.[41] However, enough data are being collected about such issues as Medicaid use that it may still be possible for evaluators to conduct analyses focused on children in order to obtain at least some new information about the effects of welfare reform on children's growth and development.[42]

More specifically, NCCP's analyses of the evaluation plans led it to the following conclusions:

- Unless they are upgraded, the waiver evaluations will not be able to demonstrate the many ways that welfare

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Implications of Past Welfare Program Evaluations for Understanding Current Welfare Reform's Effects on Children

Past evaluations provide the following limited information about the effects of previous welfare reform on children. Information from many current state welfare waiver evaluations is likely to be equally limited without additional efforts to focus at least some aspects of these evaluations on children's growth and development.

Family Income

Although some evaluations indicate that *earnings* increased as a result of participation in welfare-to-work programs, family *income* improved only in states with relatively liberal rules allowing families to combine cash benefits with earnings.[43]

Parenting

Little to no information is available about how welfare reform efforts affect parental stress and parenting styles. What is available often focuses on special populations, such as teen parents receiving welfare.

Children's Services

The availability of supports, such as health insurance and child care services (and parents' perception of their adequacy), affected parents' participation in welfare-to-work efforts. Virtually no evaluation measured how these supports affected the *children* receiving them. Without child care subsidies and continued access to health insurance, families who leave welfare for work face the same barriers to finding and maintaining adequate child care and health care as do other low-income working families.

reform may have an impact on children's growth and development. In part, this is because very few variables used directly measure changes in children's growth and development.

- Unless encouraged by the federal government or funders, evaluators will not collect variables related to children that are common across many states. The lack of common variables will dramatically reduce the chances for cross-state comparisons to inform national policy.
- A number of waiver evaluations may lead to some new information about child well-being that is readily interpretable in the area of children's education, particularly for those states that are evaluating approaches to increase children's school attendance.
- A number of waiver evaluations will track significant potential harms to children that may result from some welfare initiatives. For instance, certain evaluations measure significant family dysfunction, such as substantiated cases of child abuse and neglect, foster care placement rates, and alcohol or drug abuse.
- Variables in the evaluation plans related mostly to children's services, but few addressed the quality of services or the outcome measures that indicate the effectiveness of those services. This was particularly true in the areas of child care and child health. See the accompanying box for a summary of the findings.

Conclusion

State and local welfare reform efforts have the potential to affect children's growth and development significantly. The stakes are high. The five-year time limits for receipt of TANF funds mean that state and community policymakers and program operators may have very targeted and limited opportunities to assist families receiving cash assistance. A framework that assesses the impact of welfare reform on family income, parental stress, and access to children's services, can help clarify the potential trade-offs and policy options involved in formulating and implementing welfare reforms. Such a framework can also help to ensure that welfare approaches protect the well-being of children and use all opportunities to enhance their growth and development.

References

1. For additional information about Public Law 104-193, see the fact sheet issued by the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP). (1996). *The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Block Grant of H.R. 3734*. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy. More detailed summaries issued by CLASP are described in the resource guide accompanying this issue brief series. Many of the other organizations listed in the resource guide have released summaries as well.

2. Kotch, J. & Shackelford, J. (1989). *The nutritional status of low-income preschool children in the United States: A review of the literature*. Washington, DC: Food Research and Action Center.

Rosenbaum, S. (1992). Child health and poor children. In J. E. Korbin (Ed.), Special issue: The impact of poverty on children. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 35(3), 275–289.

Society for Research in Child Development; Society for Research on Adolescence; International Society for Infant Studies; & Division 7, American Psychological Association. (1994). *Consequences of poverty for children and families* (Research Brief Series). Chicago, IL: Society for Research in Child Development.

Zill, N.; Moore, K.; Smith, E.; Stief, T.; & Coiro, M. J. (1991). *The life circumstances and development of children in welfare families: a profile based on national survey data*. Washington, DC: Child Trends.

3. Duncan, G. J.; Brooks-Gunn, J.; & Klebanov, P. K. (1994). Economic deprivation and early childhood development. In A. C. Huston; C. T. G. Coll; & V. C. McLoyd (Eds.), Special issue: Children in poverty. *Child Development*, 65(2), 296–318.

Smith, S.; Brooks-Gunn, J.; & Klebanov, P. (Forthcoming 1997). Children in poverty: School readiness and emotional development. In G. J. Duncan & J. Brooks-Gunn (Eds.), *Consequences of growing up poor* [edited papers from a conference co-sponsored by the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development and the Russell Sage Foundation, February 2–3, 1995, at the National Academy of Sciences]. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

4. Klerman, L. V. with Parker, M. B. (1991). *Alive and well? A research and policy review of health programs for poor young children*. New York, NY: National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University School of Public Health.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.

7. Korenman, S.; Miller, J. E.; & Sjaastad, J. E. (1995). Long-term poverty and child development in the United States. *Children & Youth Services Review*, 17(1–2), 127–55.

See also Society for Research in Child Development in reference 2.

8. See Duncan in reference 3.

9. See Zill in reference 2.

10. Chase-Lansdale, P. L. & Brooks-Gunn, N. (1995). *Escape from poverty: What makes a difference for children*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Duncan, G. J. & Brooks-Gunn, J. (Eds.). (Forthcoming 1997). *Consequences of growing up poor* [edited papers from a conference co-sponsored by the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development and the Russell Sage Foundation, February 2–3, 1995, at the National Academy of Sciences]. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

11. Ibid.

12. See Zill in reference 2.

13. Belle, D. (1990). Poverty and women's mental health. *American Psychologist*, 45(3), 385–389.

14. Ibid.

15. Veltkamp, L. J. & Miller, T. W. (1994). *Clinical handbook of child abuse and neglect*. Madison, CT: International Universities Press.

Videka-Sherman, L. (1991). Child abuse and neglect. In A. Gitterman (Ed.), *Handbook of social work with vulnerable populations*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, pp. 345–381.

16. Ibid.

17. McLoyd, V. C. & Wilson, L. (1991). The strain of living poor: Parenting, social support, and child mental health. In A. Huston (Ed.), *Children in poverty: Child development and public policy*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, pp. 105–135.

18. Ibid.

19. Carnegie Task Force on Meeting the Needs of Young Children. (1994). *Starting points: Meeting the needs of our youngest children*. New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Hofferth, S. (1995). Caring for children at the poverty line. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 17(1/2), 61–90.

Phillips, D. (Ed.). (1995). *Child care for low-income families: Summary of two workshops*. Washington, DC: Board on Children and Families, Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Research Council, Institute of Medicine, distributed by National Academy Press.

Phillips, D. & Bridgman, A. (Eds.). (1995). *New findings on children, families, and economic self-sufficiency: Summary of a research briefing*. Washington, DC: Board on Children and Families, Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Research Council, Institute of Medicine, distributed by National Academy Press.

U.S. General Accounting Office. (1995). *Early childhood centers: Services to prepare poor children for school often limited*. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office.

See also reference 4 and Rosenbaum in reference 2.

20. See Rosenbaum in reference 2.

21. U.S. General Accounting Office. (1995). *Health insurance for children: Many remain uninsured despite Medicaid expansion*. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office.

Mann, C. (1995). *Medicaid block grants: The challenge for states and the risks to vulnerable populations*. Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

22. Galinsky, E.; Howes, C.; Kontos, S; & Shinn, M. (1994). *The study of children in family child care and relative care: Highlights of findings*. New York, NY: Families and Work Institute.

Garrett, P.; Ng'andu, N.; & Ferron, J. (1994). Poverty experiences of young children and the quality of their home environments. In A. C. Huston; C. T. G. Coll; & V. C. McLoyd (Eds.), Special issue: Children in poverty. *Child Development*, 65(2), 331–345.

Kisker, E. E.; Hofferth, S. L.; Phillips, D. A.; & Farquhar, E. (1991). *A profile of child care settings: Early education and care in 1990*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.

Zaslow, M. J. (1991). Variation in child care quality and its implications for children. In S. L. Hofferth & D. A. Phillips (Eds.), Journal special issue: Child care policy research. *Journal of Social Issues*, 47(2), 125–138.

See also Carnegie Task Force on Meeting the Needs of Young Children in reference 19, Duncan in reference 10, and Society for Research in Child Development in reference 2.

23. Cost, Quality, and Child Outcomes Study Team; Helburn, S.; Culkin, M.; Morris, J.; Mocan, N.; Howes, C.; Phillipsen, L.; Bryant, D.; Clifford, R.; Cryer, D.; Peisner-Feinberg, E.; Burchinal, M.; Kagan, S.; & Rustici, J. (1995). *Cost, quality, and child outcomes in child care centers*. Denver, CO: University of Colorado at Denver, Department of Economics.

Howes, C.; Smith, E.; & Galinsky, E. (1995). *The Florida child care quality improvement study*. New York, NY: Families and Work Institute.

24. Besharov, D. J. (Ed). (1988). *Protecting children from abuse and neglect: Policy and practice*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Besharov, D. J. (Ed.). (1996). *Enhancing early childhood programs: Burdens and opportunities*. Washington, DC: Child Welfare League of America Press and American Enterprise Institute.

Courtney, M.; Barth, R. P.; Berrick, J. D.; Brooks, D.; Needell, R.; & Park, L. (1996). Race and child welfare services: Past research and future directions. *Child Welfare*, 75(2), 99–137.

Golden, O. (1992). *Poor children and welfare reform*. Westport, CT: Auburn House.

Specht, H. & Courtney, M. E. (1994). *Unfaithful angels: How social work has abandoned its mission*. New York, NY: Free Press.

25. Friedlander, D. & Burtless, G. (1995). *Five years after: The long-term effects of welfare-to-work programs*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

26. Ibid.

27. Meyers, M. K.; Gilbert, N.; & Duerr-Berrick, J. (1992). *GAIN family life and child care study technical report*. Berkeley, CA: Family Welfare Research Group, Child Welfare Research Center, University of California at Berkeley.

28. Siegel, G. & Loman, L. A. (1991). *Child care and AFDC recipients in Illinois: Patterns, problems, and needs*. St. Louis, MO: Institute of Applied Research.

See also reference 23.

29. See Hofferth in reference 19.

30. Ibid.

31. See Rosenbaum in reference 2.

32. See reference 27 and Zill in reference 2.

33. See reference 27.

34. Zaslow, M.; Moore, K. A.; Coiro, M. J.; & Morrison, D. R. (1994). *Programs to enhance the self-sufficiency of welfare families: Pathways of effects on young children*. Washington, DC: Child Trends.

35. Ibid.

36. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (Sep. 18, 1996). *Survey shows dramatic increase in child abuse and neglect* [press release on data from the 1993 National Incidence Study of Child Abuse and Neglect]. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

37. Jones, E. D. & McCurdy, K. (1992). The links between types of maltreatment and demographic characteristics of children. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 16(2), 201–214.

38. Sherman, R. E. (1994). *Analysis* [of Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services: Statistical report (December 1994) and Los Angeles County Department of Social Services report: Child welfare services—children served, 1991–1994 (1994)]. Los Angeles, CA: Unpublished.

39. U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means. (1996). *1996 green book: Background material and data on programs within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means*. Washington, DC: U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means.

40. For instance, 12 states have applied for and received federal funding for a "Waivers Plus" project whose goal is to improve child outcome information that will be available through the random assignment evaluations currently being conducted. For more information, please contact Child Trends, Inc., 4301 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 100, Washington, DC 20008. (202) 362-5580/ Fax (202) 362-5533.

41. Collins, A. & Aber, J. L. (1996). *State welfare waiver evaluations: Will they increase our understanding of the impact of welfare reform on children?* New York, NY: National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia School of Public Health.

42. See information on "Waivers Plus" project coordinated by Child Trends, Inc. in reference 40.

43. The "Waivers Plus" project is designed to improve the ability of waiver evaluations to measure the impact of welfare changes on children's growth and development in 12 states. See reference 40 for more information.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Children and Welfare Reform Issue Brief Series

☐ Issue Brief 1: How Welfare Reform Can Help or Hurt Children
by Ann Collins and J. Lawrence Aber

This issue brief describes the research base for NCCP's framework to assess welfare changes from a children's perspective and it points to lessons from current and welfare-to-work evaluations. (1997). 12 pp.

☐ Issue Brief 2: Anticipating the Effects of Federal and State Welfare Changes on Systems that Serve Children
by Ann Collins

This issue brief focuses on processes to assess how federal and state welfare initiatives will have an impact on state and community policies and systems that serve children and families. (In press).

☐ Issue Brief 3: The New Welfare Law and Vulnerable Families: Implications for Child Welfare/Child Protection Systems
by Jane Knitzer and Stanley Bernard

This issue brief examines the potential impact of P.L. 104-193 on vulnerable families already in or at risk of entering the child welfare/child protection systems. (In press).

☐ Issue Brief 4: The Implications of TANF for Child Care Subsidy Policies
(Forthcoming late Spring 1997)

☐ Issue Brief 5: Child Care Assistance for Non-TANF Families
(Forthcoming Summer 1997)

☐ Issue Brief 6: Child Care by Relatives and Friends
(Forthcoming Summer 1997)

☐ Resource Guide
This handbook describes internet sites, documents, and organizations that provide information on welfare reform and P.L. 104-193 and the likely impact on children.
(Forthcoming Summer 1997)

The above issue briefs are $5.00 each; deduct $5.00 if ordering four or more issue briefs.

Related NCCP Publications on Children and Welfare Reform

☐ Children and Welfare Reform: Highlights from Recent Research
by Ann Collins, Stephanie Jones, and Heather Bloom

This publication summarizes 34 recent reports, articles, and studies that are highly relevant to the current debate over welfare reform and its implications for the largest group of welfare recipients—children. The research covers the links between welfare reform and the following categories: developmental risks for children in poverty, profiles of adults receiving public assistance, economic issues for families leaving welfare for work, program strategies and their implications for children, child care, child health, and families with teenage parents. The research illuminates the three major ways that welfare reform could affect children's growth and development: (1) by affecting family income; (2) by affecting the levels of stress and parenting styles of adults receiving public assistance; or (3) by influencing the access to and the quality of services that children receive. (1996). 68 pp. $10.00

☐ Map and Track: State Initiatives for Young Children and Families
by Jane Knitzer and Stephen Page

This report is designed to "map" state initiatives for young children and families and "track" them over time. It provides state-by-state data that is highly relevant to the current debate over states' responsibility for the welfare of young children and their families. The baseline data, as of the fall of 1995, describes state initiatives that address the multiple needs of young children and their families—including comprehensive family support and early care and education strategies and other program and planning activities. It also includes state-by-state information on Young Child and Family Risk Indicators (e.g., young child poverty rates, percentage of children in overcrowded housing) and state investments in basic health and development for children. (1996). 171 pp. $19.95

☐ One in Four: America's Youngest Poor

This report is the Center's first book-length analysis of young child poverty in the United States since its 1990 report, *Five Million Children*. *One in Four* examines trends in the young child poverty rate (YCPR) over the last twenty years and answers several key questions about poor children under age six, such as: How many poor young children are there? Where do they live? What are the employment characteristics of their parents? How many live in two-parent or single-parent families? What are the racial and ethnic backgrounds? In what type of residential area (urban, suburban, or rural) and among which racial group is the YCPR increasing most rapidly? Why is the YCPR of vital importance to the United States? What are the policy implications of America's remarkably high YCPR? *One in Four* provides the YCPRs for each of the fifty states and for America's twelve largest cities. It places America's YCPR in an international context and examines trends for extreme young child poverty and young children in families in near poverty. (1996). Full Report, 88 pp. $16.95 Abridged Version, 32 pp. $7.95

☐ State Welfare Waiver Evaluations: Will They Increase Our Understanding of the Impact of Welfare Reform on Children?
by Ann Collins and J. Lawrence Aber

This working paper analyzes 21 evaluation plans for state welfare experiments to determine how current welfare reform evaluations measure effects on children. A summary of relevant prior research examines three areas where welfare reform could have a major impact on children: (1) by changing family income, (2) by affecting parental stress and parenting, and (3) by changing children's access to services and supports outside the family that promote children's healthy growth and development. The findings show that many evaluations collect data that will track children's education, access to health insurance, and experiences with child welfare systems. Includes research questions and children's well-being variables tracked in 21 waiver evaluations and a list of state contacts for more information. (1996). 37 pp. $10.00

☐ Young Children in Poverty: An Annotated Bibliography of Books and Reports, 1995 Edition
compiled by Carole J. Oshinsky

This volume describes 79 key books, reports, analyses, and special journal issues published from 1990 to 1995 related to young children and their families living in poverty in the United States. It examines policies and programs designed to assist poor children and their parents. Selections reflect the following criteria: national scope, relevance to children in poverty, substantive orientation, practicality, and timeliness. Entries include price and ordering information. (1995). 80 pp. $12.00

Prepayment or a purchase order is required. Make checks payable to Columbia University and mail to NCCP Publications, 154 Haven Avenue, New York, NY 10032, or fax your purchase order to (212) 544-4200.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NATIONAL CENTER FOR CHILDREN IN POVERTY
Columbia School of Public Health
154 Haven Avenue, New York, NY 10032
Tel: (212) 304-7100 Fax: (212) 544-4200
WWW: http://cpmcnet.columbia.edu/dept/nccp

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor: National Center for Children in Poverty Columbia School of Public Health
Address: 154 Haven Avenue New York, NY 10032
Price: $5.00, Includes Shipping and Handling

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:	KAREN E. SMITH ACQUISITIONS COORDINATOR ERIC/EECE CHILDREN'S RESEARCH CENTER 51 GERTY DRIVE CHAMPAIGN, ILLINOIS 61820-7469

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2d Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

(Rev. 6/96)